UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,017	10/31/2003	Gilbert G. Weigand	06975-335001/ Personaliza	7142

26171 7590 02/20/2008	**EXAMINER**
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022	BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/698,017	WEIGAND ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BENJAMIN R. BRUCKART	2155	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 October 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-58</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-58</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 October 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-58 are pending in this Office Action.

The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, l 1-4). The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense. The Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

Formal Drawings

The formal drawings received on 10/31/03 have been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-29 are directed to statutory subject matter because the method falls within the statutory category of a process and has a useful result.

Claims 30-57 are directed to statutory subject matter because the system is believed to be embodied in hardware (spec page 6, line 24-25).

Claim 58 is directed to statutory subject matter because the means for system is not is believed to be only software because it is embodied in hardware (spec page 6, line 24-25).

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claims 13-15 and 41-43 recite the limitations of encoding a location label

"magnetically encoded on the medium," "optically encoded on the medium," and "visually

encoded on the medium." Such terminology is absent from the specification, especially

information detailing how this is performed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-15, 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

claimed invention. Claims 13-15 recite the limitations of encoding a location label

"magnetically encoded on the medium," "optically encoded on the medium," and "visually

encoded on the medium." Such terminology is absent from the specification, especially

information detailing how this is performed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13-15, 41-43 recites the limitations of encoding a location label "magnetically

encoded on the medium," "optically encoded on the medium," and "visually encoded on the

medium." Such terminology is absent from the specification, especially information detailing

how this is performed. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1, 3, 6-15, 17-21, 23, 25-29; 30, 32, 34-43, 45-49, 51, 53-57;and 58 are rejected
under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0023010 by
Rittmaster et al.**

Regarding claim 1, a method of managing access to content (Rittmaster: page 1, para 9-11), the

method comprising:

receiving a content request initiated at a jukebox for access to a content selection

(Rittmaster: page 2 and 3, para 31, 35);

identifying a jukebox location corresponding to a location of the jukebox (Rittmaster:

page 3, para 36-37);

determining a permissible location for rendering the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3,

para 39);

relating the jukebox location to the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39); and

enabling the content request when the permissible location supports access to the content

selection from the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 1 wherein receiving the content request includes triggering the content request based on the jukebox downloading the content selection from a host (Rittmaster: page 2, para 31; page 5, para 56).

Regarding claim 6, the method of claim 1 wherein receiving the content request includes triggering the content request based on the jukebox accessing an encoded, publicly-distributed signal so that the publicly-distributed signal may be accessed in a decoded form (Rittmaster: page 2, para 31; page 5, para 56).

Regarding claim 7, the method of claim 1 wherein identifying the jukebox location includes using a Global Positioning System receiver to determine the jukebox location associated with the jukebox accessing the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 36-38).

Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 1 wherein identifying the jukebox location includes using network information associated with the jukebox generating the content request to identify the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 8-9, para 83).

Regarding claim 9, the method of claim 8 wherein using network information to identify the jukebox location includes correlating an Internet Protocol (IP) address with a geographical region that encompasses the jukebox (Rittmaster: page 8-9, para 83).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 1 wherein identifying the jukebox location includes identifying a user identity associated with the content request or the jukebox related to the content request, correlating the user identity with billing information, and using the billing information to identify the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 20, para 163).

Regarding claim 11, the method of claim 10 wherein determining the permissible location includes reading a location label associated with a medium that includes the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 12, the method of claim 10 wherein reading the location label includes reading a geographical location or region from which access to the content selection is permissible (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 13, the method of claim 10 wherein the location label is magnetically encoded on the medium that includes the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 33; page 10, para 94).

Regarding claim 14, the method of claim 10 wherein the location label is optically encoded on the medium that includes the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 33).

Regarding claim 15, the method of claim 10 is usually encoded wherein the location label is visually encoded on the medium that includes the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 33).

Regarding claim 17, the method of claim 1 wherein relating the jukebox location to the permissible location includes determining whether the jukebox location lies within a geographic region described by the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 18, the method of claim 17, wherein determining whether the jukebox location lies within the geographical region includes determining whether the jukebox location lies within a predetermined distance of the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 5, para 54; range from coordinates)

Regarding claim 19, the method of claim 17 wherein determining the permissible location includes resolving an address to a location (Rittmaster: page 8-9, para 83).

Regarding claim 20, the method of claim 17 wherein determining the permissible location includes resolving company information to an address (Rittmaster: page 8-9, 12; para 83, 112).

Regarding claim 21, the method of claim 1 further comprising denying the content request when the permissible location does not support using the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 23, the method of claim 1 further comprising enabling the content request for a limited class of content requests when the permissible location does not support using the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 5-6, para 58).

Regarding claim 25, the method of claim 1 further comprising enabling the content request when the user registers to participate in a location-based content regulation system (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).

Regarding claim 26, the method of claim 25 further comprising providing an automated interface enabling the user to participate in the location-based content regulation system (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).

Regarding claim 27, the method of claim 1 further comprising enabling the permissible location to be modified (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).

Regarding claim 28, the method of claim 27 wherein enabling the permissible location to be modified includes modifying the permissible location by interfacing with a host that manages the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).

Regarding claim 29, the method of claim 27 wherein enabling the permissible location to be modified includes enabling the user to modify the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).

Regarding claim 30, a location-based content regulation system (Rittmaster: page 1, para 9-11) comprising:

a content system structured and arranged to receive a content request initiated at a jukebox location for accessing a content selection (Rittmaster: page 2 and 3, para 31, 35);

a location processor structured and arranged to identify a jukebox location corresponding to a location of the jukebox (Rittmaster: page 3, para 36-37);

a location watermark reader structured and arranged to determine a permissible location for rendering the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39);

a regulating processor structured and arranged to relate the jukebox location to the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39); and

a decision processor structured and arranged to enable the content request when the permissible location supports access to the content selection from the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 32, the system of claim 30 wherein the content system is structured and arranged to trigger the content request based on a jukebox downloading the content selection from a host (Rittmaster: page 2, para 31; page 5, para 56).

Regarding claim 34, the system of claim 30 wherein the content system is structured and arranged to trigger the content request based on a jukebox accessing an encoded, publicly-distributed signal so that the publicly distributed signal may be accessed in a decoded form (Rittmaster: page 2, para 31; page 5, para 56).

Regarding claim 35, the system of claim 30 wherein the location processor is structured and arranged to use a Global Positioning System receiver to determine the jukebox location associated with a jukebox accessing the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 36-38).

Regarding claim 36, the system of claim 30 wherein the location processor is structured and arranged to use network information associated with a jukebox generating the content request to identify the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 8-9, para 83).

Regarding claim 37, the system of claim 36 wherein the location processor is structured and

arranged to correlate an Internet Protocol (IP) address with a geographical region that encompasses the jukebox (Rittmaster: page 8-9, para 83).

Regarding claim 38, the system of claim 36 wherein the location processor is structured and arranged to identify the jukebox location by identifying a user identity associated with the content request or a jukebox related to the content request, correlating the user identity with billing information, and using the billing information to identify the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 20, para 163).

Regarding claim 39, the system of claim 36 wherein the location watermark reader is structured and arranged to read a location label associated with a medium that includes the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 40, the system of claim 39 wherein the location label indicates a geographical location or region from which access to the content selection is permissible (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 41, the system of claim 39 wherein the location label is magnetically encoded on the medium that includes the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 33; page 10, para 94).

Regarding claim 42, the system of claim 39 wherein the location label is optically encoded on the medium that includes the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 33).

Regarding claim 43, the system of claim 39 wherein the location label is visually encoded on the medium that includes the content selection (Rittmaster: page 3, para 33).

Regarding claim 45, the system of claim 30 wherein the regulating processor is structured and arranged to determine whether the jukebox location lies within a geographic region described by the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 46, the system of claim 45 wherein the regulating processor is structured and arranged to determine whether the jukebox location lies within a predetermined distance of the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 8-9, para 83).

Regarding claim 47, the system of claim 45 wherein the regulating processor is structured and arranged to resolve an address to a location (Rittmaster: page 8-9, para 83).

Regarding claim 48, the system of claim 45 wherein the regulating processor is structured and arranged to resolve company information to an address that can be resolved to a location (Rittmaster: page 8-9, 12; para 83, 112).

Regarding claim 49, the system of claim 30 wherein the decision processor is structured and arranged to deny the content request when the permissible location does not support using the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Regarding claim 51, the system of claim 30 wherein the decision processor is structured and arranged to enable the content request for a limited class of content requests when the permissible location does not support using the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 5-6, para 58).

Regarding claim 53, the system of claim 30 wherein the decision processor is structured and arranged to enable the content request when the user registers to participate in a location-based content regulation system (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).

Regarding claim 54, the system of claim 53 further comprising a display process structured and arranged to provide an automated interface enabling the user to participate in the location-based content regulation system (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).).

Regarding claim 55, the system of claim 30 further comprising a modification processor structured and arranged to enable the permissible location to be modified (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).

Regarding claim 56, the system of claim 55 wherein the modification processor is structured and arranged to modify the permissible location by interfacing with a host that manages the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).

Regarding claim 57, the system of claim 55 wherein the modification processor is structured and arranged to enable the user to modify the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 9,10, para 91).

Regarding claim 58, a location-based content regulation system (Rittmaster: page 1, para 9-11) comprising:

means for receiving a content request initiated at a jukebox for access to a content selection (Rittmaster: page 2 and 3, para 31, 35);

means for identifying a jukebox location corresponding to a location of the jukebox (Rittmaster: page 3, para 36-37);

means for determining a permissible location for rendering the content selection; means for relating the jukebox location to the permissible location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39); and means for enabling the content request when the permissible location supports access to the content selection from the jukebox location (Rittmaster: page 3, para 39).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0023010 by Rittmaster et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0188007 by Unger.

Regarding claim 2,

The Rittmaster reference teaches the method of claim 1.

The Rittmaster reference fails to teach triggering the content request based on reading an optical disk.

However, the Unger reference teaches receiving a content request includes triggering the content request based on the jukebox reading an optical disk that includes the content selection (Unger: page 5, para 52) in order to initiate communication between a device and host (Unger: page 5, para 53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the method as taught by Rittman to include triggered content request as taught by Unger in order to initiate communication between a device and host (Unger: page 5, para 53).

Regarding claim 31,

The Rittmaster reference teaches the system of claim 30.

The Rittmaster reference fails to teach triggering the content request based on reading an optical disk.

However, the Unger reference teaches the content system is structured and arranged to trigger the content request based on a jukebox to read an optical disk to play the content selection (Unger: page 5, para 52) in order to initiate communication between a device and host (Unger: page 5, para 53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the method as taught by Rittman to include triggered content request as taught by Unger in order to initiate communication between a device and host (Unger: page 5, para 53).

Claims 4-5 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0023010 by Rittmaster et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20050060405 by Nathan et al.

Regarding claim 4,

The Rittmaster reference teaches the method of claim 1.

The Rittmaster reference fails to teach triggering the requested based on analog content.

However, the Nathan reference teaches receiving the content request includes triggering the content request based on the jukebox accessing an analog content selection so that the analog content selection may be accessed (Nathan: page 4, para 31) in order to allow immediate play on the remote device (Nathan: page 4, para 31).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Rittmaster to include triggering the requested based on analog content as taught by Nathan in order to allow immediate play on the remote device (Nathan: page 4, para 31).

Regarding claim 5,

The Rittmaster reference teaches the method of claim 1.

The Rittmaster reference fails to teach triggering the requested based on analog content.

However, the Nathan reference teaches receiving the content request includes triggering the content request based on the jukebox reading a content label associated with accessing a film so that the film may be accessed (Nathan: page 1 and 4, para 4-5, 31) in order to allow immediate play on the remote device (Nathan: page 4, para 31).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Rittmaster to include triggering the requested based on analog content as taught by Nathan in order to allow immediate play on the remote device (Nathan: page 4, para 31).

Regarding claim 33,

The Rittmaster reference teaches the system of claim 30.

The Rittmaster reference fails to teach triggering the requested based on analog content.

However, the Nathan reference teaches the content system is structured and arranged to trigger the content request based on a jukebox accessing an analog content selection (Nathan: page 4, para 31) in order to allow immediate play on the remote device (Nathan: page 4, para 31).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Rittmaster to include triggering the requested based on analog content in order to allow immediate play on the remote device (Nathan: page 4, para 31).

Claims 16 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0023010 by Rittmaster et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087692 by Woods et al.

Regarding claim 16,

The Rittmaster reference teaches the method of claim 1.

The Rittmaster reference fails to teach polling the server.

However, the Woods reference teaches determining permissibility includes polling a host to identify where the content selection may be used in the content request (Woods: page 4, para 31) in order to determine if content is accessible (Woods: page 4, para 31).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Rittmaster to include polling the server as taught by Woods in order to determine if content is accessible (Woods: page 4, para 31).

Regarding claim 44,

The Rittmaster reference teaches the system of claim 30.

The Rittmaster reference fails to teach polling the server.

However, the Woods reference teaches the location watermark reader is structured and arranged to poll a host to identify where the content selection may be used in the content request (Woods: page 4, para 31) in order to determine if content is accessible (Woods: page 4, para 31).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Rittmaster to include polling the server as taught by Woods in

order to determine if content is accessible (Woods: page 4, para 31).

Claims 22 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0023010 by Rittmaster et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0031558 by Ortega et al.

Regarding claim 22,

The Rittmaster reference teaches the method of claim 1.

The Rittmaster reference fails to teach limited time access.

However, the Ortega reference teaches enabling the content request for a limited period of time when the permissible location does not support using the jukebox location (Ortega: page 1, para 15) in order to prevent unauthorized access to content (Ortega: page 1, para 2-3).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Rittmaster to include limited time access as taught by Ortega in order to prevent unauthorized access to content (Ortega: page 1, para 2-3).

Regarding claim 50,

The Rittmaster reference teaches the system of claim 30.

The Rittmaster reference fails to teach limited time access.

However, the Ortega reference teaches the decision processor is structured and arranged to enable the content request for a limited period of time when the permissible location does not support using the jukebox location (Ortega: page 1, para 15) in order to prevent unauthorized access to content (Ortega: page 1, para 2-3).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Rittmaster to include limited time access as taught by Ortega in order to prevent unauthorized access to content (Ortega: page 1, para 2-3).

Claims 24 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0023010 by Rittmaster et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0225863 by Kajino et al.

Regarding claim 24,

        The Rittmaster reference teaches the method of claim 23.

        The Rittmaster reference fails to teach permissions.

        However, the Kajino reference teaches enabling the content request for the limited class of content requests includes enabling read-only operations and denying copy operations (Kajino: pages 2-4, para 37 and 16) in order to control the replication of materials based on ownership and authorization (Kajino: page 2, para 19-21).

        It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Rittmaster to include permissions with content as taught by Kajino in order to control the replication of materials based on ownership and authorization (Kajino: page 2, para 19-21).

Regarding claim 52,

        The Rittmaster reference teaches the system of claim 51.

        The Rittmaster reference fails to teach permissions.

        However, the Kajino reference teaches wherein the decision processor is structured and arranged to enable read-only operations and deny copy operations (Kajino: pages 2-4, para 37 and 16) in order to control the replication of materials based on ownership and authorization (Kajino: page 2, para 19-21).

        It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method as taught by Rittmaster to include permissions with content as taught by Kajino in order to control the replication of materials based on ownership and authorization (Kajino: page 2, para 19-21).

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent Publication No. 20050086391 by Chu et al teaches polling for location data before authorization of software.

U. S. Patent Publication No. 20030217122 by Roese et al teaches determining authorizations of a client device based on its location.

U. S. Patent Publication No. 20040054920 by Wilson et al encoding content and controlling access to said content based on DRM.

U. S. Patent Publication No. 20020154777 by Candelore teaches authententication the location of content players.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number 571-272-3982.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and after final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the examiner whose telephone number is 571-272-3982.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER